

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

HEADWATER RESEARCH LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

T-MOBILE USA, INC. AND SPRINT CORP.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2:23-CV-00379-JRG-RSP

HEADWATER RESEARCH LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

T-MOBILE USA, INC. AND SPRINT CORP.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2:23-CV-00377-JRG-RSP

DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SIXTH OPPOSED MOTION *IN LIMINE*

Defendants respectfully move the Court for leave to file a sixth opposed motion *in limine*, in addition to the five motions allowed by the Court's Standing Order. The proposed sixth motion *in limine* is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

Specifically, Defendants seek leave to file a motion *in limine* that is identical to a MIL the Court has already adopted in the *Samsung* litigation: that Headwater be precluded from presenting evidence, testimony, or argument that [Defendants'] fact witnesses have not read the patents-in-suit or formed opinions regarding the patents-in-suit unless the witnesses were designated on such topics; and shall not present any argument, evidence, or testimony suggesting that a party's corporate representative at trial is obligated to prepare on any particular topic or is charged with

knowledge of others within the company unless said representative was previously designated as a 30(b)(6) witness on said topic. *Headwater Research, LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, No. 2:22-CV-422-JRG-RSP, Dkt. No. 350 at 4 (E.D. Tex. July 8, 2024).

During the meet and confer process, Headwater indicated it would agree to the MIL, except it insisted on two new caveats, both of which are improper. The nature of these demanded caveats, and the reasons why they are improper, is addressed in the attached proposed sixth MIL.

The Court has discretion to allow the filing of additional motions *in limine* when good cause is shown. Here, good cause exists. The motion *in limine* should not be disputed, as the Court already entered a MIL with precisely the same language against Headwater in an earlier case on substantively similar facts, and the new caveats Headwater insists on are improper. Defendants respectfully submit that the additional burden of a sixth MIL is minimal, as the issue has already been briefed and decided in a prior case. Moreover, Defendants should not be required to use one of their five disputed MILs to address a topic that should be undisputed, and is only disputed because Headwater insists on two improper caveats that appear nowhere in the prior order.

For the foregoing reasons, Defendants respectfully request that the Court grant this motion for leave to file an additional motion *in limine*.

Dated: May 1, 2025

By: /s/ Josh A. Krevitt

Josh A. Krevitt

jkrevitt@gibsondunn.com

Katherine Q. Dominguez

kdominguez@gibsondunn.com

Brian A. Rosenthal

brosenthal@gibsondunn.com

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

200 Park Avenue

New York, NY 10166-0193

Telephone: 212.351.4000
Facsimile: 212.351.4035

Robert Vincent
rvincent@gibsondunn.com
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 2100
Dallas, TX 75201
Telephone: 214.698.3112
Facsimile: 214.571.2910

Andrew W. Robb (CA Bar No. 291438)
arobb@gibsondunn.com
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
310 University Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94301
Telephone: 650.849.5334
Facsimile: 650.849.5034

Michelle Zhu
mzhu@gibsondunn.com
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
1700 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: 202.777.9413
Fax: 202.831.6063

Celine Crowson (D.C. Bar No. 0436549A)
Hogan Lovells
555 13th St NW,
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202-637-5600
celine.crowson@hoganlovells.com

Tej Singh (California Bar No. 286547)
Yi Zhang (California Bar No. 342823)
Kyle Xu (California Bar No. 344100)
Hogan Lovells
4 Embarcadero Center Suite 3500
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: 415-374-2300
tej.singh@hoganlovells.com
yi.zhang@hoganlovells.com
kyle.xu@hoganlovells.com

Melissa R. Smith

melissa@gillamsmithlaw.com
GILLIAM & SMITH, LLP
303 South Washington Avenue
Marshall, TX 75670
Telephone: (903) 934-8450
Facsimile: (903) 934-9257

Attorneys for Defendants

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing document has been served on all counsel of record via the Court's ECF system on May 1, 2025.

/s/ *Josh A. Krevitt*
Josh A. Krevitt

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

I hereby certify that pursuant to Local Rules CV-7(h) and (i), counsel for Defendants conferred with counsel for Plaintiff regarding this Motion. Counsel for Plaintiff indicated that they oppose the relief sought herein.

/s/ *Josh A. Krevitt*
Josh A. Krevitt